

REMARKS:

The specification has been amended to remove the heading “Description” on the first page, even though this heading was inserted automatically by electronic filing software provided by the Office. Applicants respectfully decline to provide a new specification with numbered pages in view of the fact that the application as filed complied with all electronic filing requirements. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(a)(6); *see also* “Legal Framework for the Use of the Electronic Filing System”, 1263 OG 60 (Oct. 8, 2002) (“To the extent that any USPTO rule is inconsistent with EFS, the rule will be interpreted in a manner to support EFS and waived, when necessary, until formal regulations directed to electronic submissions are promulgated. ... ***Documents compliant with the requirements expressed in the EFS documentation will not be held to violate the regulations solely because of their electronic nature or the electronic submission process.***”)

The claims have been amended to define more precisely and clearly what the Applicants consider to be the invention. Specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all limitations of cancelled dependent claim 4, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 2–3 and 5–13 each depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and are therefore also allowable for at least the same reason as amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment overcomes all prior art rejections identified by the Examiner.

The remaining amendments are substantially in accordance with those suggested by the Examiner in the Office action, with one exception: claim 5 has not been amended as required by the Examiner to replace “outlet (68)” with “outlet (69)”. The “outlet” recited in claim 5 is defined by the guide means for the tangential flow (F1) inside the blade. As clearly explained in paragraph 0023 of the specification, in the embodiment described and depicted, the tangential flow F1 runs through passages 62 from cavity 42 to conduit 18. In this embodiment, the “inlet” to passage 62 is holes 48, 51 (by which passage 62 communicates with cavity 42), while the “outlet” is holes 68 (which communicate with conduit 18), not the outlets 69 of those holes. This is clarified further in claim 6, where it is recited that ***“outlet (68) [is] coincident with said holes.”*** By way of distinction, outlets 69 are the exits of holes 68 and serve as the outlets of air

from the entire blade, not the as the outlet of the guide means recited in claim 5. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate and incorrect to amend claim 5 as suggested by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the claim rejections and indicate the allowance of all claims in the next paper from the Office.

The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application.

The undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 01-2508, referencing Order No. 12693.0023.00US00.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned representative by telephone to discuss any issues or questions presented by this paper.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira D. Finkelstein

Patent Attorney

Reg. No. 44,680

Tel. 713-787-1631

Date: January 18, 2005